(1) (3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (CG)

WRIT PETITION NO. 3215 /2006 **SINGLE BENCH**

PETITIONER — **Suryabali Verma, aged about 65 years, son of Late Tuphani Prasad Verma, retired Head Master, Ambikapur (East), Kalgasa Primary School, Ambikapur, Distt. Surguja (Chhattisgarh) Permanent Address: C/o. Govindji Mishra, Near Moulvi Dam, Namnakala, Ambikapur Distt. Surguja (Chhattisgarh)**

P.R. No. 3269/06
Presented by Shri A.N. Bhakta
dated 30/6/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. **State of Chhattisgarh, through – Secretary, Department of School Education, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)**
2. **Accountant General, State of Chhattisgarh, Raipur**
3. **Distt. Education Officer, Education District Ambikapur (C.G.)**

RECEIVED-COPY
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR
30.06.06

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA,

01 PARTICULARS ABOVE THE

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ....W.P.3215/.. **सन् 2006**

(21)

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

4-7-2006

Mr. A.N. Bhakta, counsel for the petitioner.

Miss Deepali Pandey, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents No.1 & 3, on advance copy.

Mr. S.K. Beriwal, Central Govt. Counsel for respondent No.2, on advance copy.

Heard.

The case of the petitioner is that he retired from the post of Head Master, Department of School Education, Chhattisgarh on 31-12-2002. His further case is that from his GPF account, an amount of Rs.41,700/-, as part final payment, has been wrongly deducted twice, whereas it should have been deducted once. When the petitioner raised objection, he received a letter dated 26-5-2006 from respondent No.2 for sending his representation if he has any objection regarding the calculation, on which the petitioner sent his representation on 22-6-2006 (Annexure P-3) and the Department also sent the same on 24-6-2006, but the same is not being considered and decided by Office of the Accountant General.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that therefore, Office of the Accountant General be directed to decide the representation/objection of the petitioner regarding the double deduction of GPF amount to which learned counsel appearing for the respondents have no objection.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner is just, fair and reasonable. Therefore, respondent No.2 is

VAKALATNAMA

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... W.P.3215/ **सन्** 2006

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
Soma	directed to examine the representation of the petitioner after scrutiny of records and decide the same, in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge	